

REMARKS

Claim 5 is pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4 are cancelled, and claim 5 is added. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for new claim 5 can be found throughout the specification, for example in at least (1) the original claims, (2) page 62, line 8 to page 63, line 7, (3) page 64, line 23 to page 65, line 13, (4) page 67, line 1 to page 70, line 2, and (5) Figure 24.

I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102**A. Wood**

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,053,971 ("Wood"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants initially point out that claims 1-4 were cancelled, and claim 5 is added.

According to the present disclosure, by only designating two factors, such as the type of material and the kind of machining, values of three parameters required for various series of machining steps including rough machining and finishing machining (i.e., the number of revolutions of the lens, the turning speed of the lens, and the turning speed of the revolving machining tool, as recited in claim 5) are read from a table, and the series of machining steps can be performed. Thus, without needing to change an edging blade, the series of machining steps can be performed at once.

Particularly, by constituting the table as described above, the values of the three parameters required for machining (i.e., the number of revolutions of the lens, the turning speed of the lens, and the turning speed of the revolving machining tool, as recited in claim 5) can be immediately read from the table, by only designating two factors, such as the type of material in the columns and the kind of machining in the rows. Thus, one simple table may be used to perform a relatively complicated machining process.

Applicants submit that Wood does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Specifically, Wood does not teach or suggest performing a series of machining steps, from rough machining to chamfering machining, at once under an optimum condition by using the recited table, while considering the type of material and edge thickness of the lens to be machined.

The recited lens machining method is capable of obtaining an excellent advantage, i.e., performing a series of machining steps, that can not be obtained by the method taught by Wood. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have achieved the claimed lens machining method from the method disclosed by Wood.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Wood does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

B. Mizuno

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,074,280 ("Mizuno"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants initially point out that claims 1-4 are cancelled, and claim 5 is added.

As with Wood, Mizuno does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Specifically, Mizuno does not teach or suggest performing a series of machining steps, from rough machining to chamfering machining, at once under an optimum condition by using the recited table, while considering the type of material and edge thickness of the lens to be machined.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Mizuno does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

C. Shibata

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,050,877 ("Shibata"). This rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants initially point out that claims 1-4 are cancelled, and claim 5 is added.

As with Wood and Mizuno, Shibata does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Specifically, Shibata does not teach or suggest performing a series of machining steps, from rough machining to chamfering machining, at once under an optimum condition by using the recited table, while considering the type of material and edge thickness of the lens to be machined.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that Shibata does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mizuno. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants initially point out that claim 2 has been cancelled and claim 5 have been added. As explained in detail above, Mizuno does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 5. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claim 5 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

Leana Levin

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Leana Levin
Registration No. 51,939

JAO:LL/can

Date: October 10, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--